

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1635

it went over the boundary." Why did these planes not cross the boundary in an effort to locate, protect, and turn back the unarmed trainer?

Third. Was there any means by which either the fighter planes or American ground control officers could communicate with the Soviet fighter which intercepted the American trainer or with any Soviet or East Germany ground control officers?

Fourth. Have American State Department or Defense Department officials any answer to the question raised editorially by the Chicago Tribune on January 31 as follows:

What is the much vaunted "hot line" between White House and Kremlin for if not to avert incidents such as this, where an inadvertence may be mistakenly interpreted as an act of aggression?

Fifth. Most important of all, is it official State Department and administration policy to regard such "incidents" as having no bearing or effect on "larger East-West policy issues?" In other words, does the State Department and this administration propose to persist in wheat sales, cultural exchanges, disarmament negotiations, and other cooperative dealings with Soviet Russia based on the premise of "mellowing" Communists while those selfsame Communists persist in brutal and murderous acts of this type?

Sixth. In a word, has our State Department lost all contact with reality?

Incidentally, I wonder if our State Department has officially tendered their thanks to the officials of Soviet Russia and East German for their courtesy in returning the bodies of the men they murdered.

Under permission to include extraneous material, I insert the Washington Star article and the Chicago Tribune editorial which I referred to:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Feb. 2, 1964]

RED DOWNING OF U.S. PLANE NOW CALLED CLOSED INCIDENT

U.S. officials say they consider the shooting down of an American jet trainer plane over East Germany to be a closed incident so far as its effect on larger East-West policy issues is concerned.

Officials were still mystified yesterday as to why American ground control officers were unable to contact the plane and call it back when they realized it was off course in flying toward the East German border last Tuesday. The mystery may never be solved. The three officers aboard were killed in the crash.

Information now available in Washington is that strenuous efforts were made by the Air Force to get the crew to turn aside before crossing the border.

These efforts, it was reported, included sending up two U.S. fighters to intercept the trainer. These planes were unable to reach the trainer before it went over the boundary. Attempts then were continued to establish communications contact with the aircraft but they failed to get any response.

NO EXCUSE FOR SHOOTING

U.S. officials have been told that a Russian fighter which intercepted the trainer first wagged its wings in a signal that the trainer should land and then fired warning bursts in front of the aircraft to force it to land.

The judgment of U.S. policymakers is that there was no excuse for the Russians to shoot

down the plane and that their efforts should have been continued to force it to land safely or to turn it back.

However, since the Russians have returned the bodies of the airmen as well as the wrecked aircraft, the view of officials now is that no worthwhile purpose can be served by continuing to make an issue of what they consider an extremely unfortunate, but closed, incident.

Meanwhile, the fire-scarred remains of the downed jet were trucked into West Berlin yesterday for study by U.S. Air Force investigators.

TRUCKS BRING WRECKAGE

The largest fragments of the unarmed, twin-engine T-39 North American Sabreliner were its swept-back wings. One had been torn away in the air during the shooting.

Using two trucks, a six-man U.S. Air Force team brought in the wreckage.

Investigators probed the debris for information that might shed light on why the Sabreliner strayed across the Iron Curtain on its flight above the clouds. Instrument failure was one suggestion in speculation as to why the plane drifted over East Germany.

A mortuary team on Friday recovered the bodies of the fliers—Lt. Col. Gerald Hannaford, 41, of Austin, Tex.; Capt. Donald Millard, 33, of Ukiah, Calif.; and Capt. John Lorraine, 34, of Jacksonville, Fla.

WING MILE FROM CRASH SITE

Capt. Miles J. McNaughton of St. James, Mo., who directed the recovery, said 95 percent of the plane's wreckage was scattered over a relatively small area.

The stray wing was handed over to the Americans by Soviet troops and East German police. Capt. McNaughton said the Russians told him this wing had been found about 1.2 miles from the site crash. Finding of the wing this far away could mean it was shot off or that the plane exploded in the air.

Civilians living in the Vogelsberg area, where the crash occurred, reported they had heard machine gun and cannon fire.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

MURDER IN THE SKIES

The Russians have replied in their usual brutal and perfidious manner to the so-called "peace offensive," proclaimed just 4 weeks ago by President Johnson. They have admitted "undertaking measures" which resulted in the crash of an unarmed U.S. Air Force training plane in Communist East Germany and the death of all three officers aboard it. It was hardly necessary for Washington to add that these "measures" meant shooting the unarmed T-39 jet trainer down.

This is the Soviet reply to Mr. Johnson's invitation for peace. This is Mr. Khrushchev's contribution toward the "joint effort" which, he said in a New Year's message, could make 1964 "a year of decisive change for the better." This is his response to his own plea for "peaceful cooperation, good neighborliness, and friendship."

This is the brutal treatment we get in reply to Mr. Johnson's offer to negotiate our differences when he recently opened the latest session of the perennial disarmament conference at Geneva. This is how we are repaid for our wheat and our cultural exchanges and all the other signs of friendship we have blindly given or promised.

The small plane apparently strayed across the Iron Curtain in a thunderstorm. The resulting atrocity should remind those in charge of our Air Force abroad that neither mercy nor restraint can be expected from our alleged friends in the Kremlin.

It was patently absurd for the Soviet note to refer to the flight as a "gross provocation." What is the much vaunted "hot line" between White House and Kremlin for if not to

avert incidents such as this, where an inadvertence may be mistakenly interpreted as an act of aggression?

If Khrushchev wants friendship, let him first demonstrate by affirmative acts that he will rectify the innumerable wrongs which exist in the world as a direct result of his policies. Until then, let our leaders stop their sentimental and unrealistic chatter about the "mellowing" nature of gun-toting Communists, and let them cease heaping gratuitous favors on bloody-handed tyrants.

As we said only last Sunday, "It would seem to be high time that the administration got the idea that there are bad guys in this world and they do not change—a rule which disposes of any illusions about Khrushchev, Sukarno, Tito, and the lot."

OUR POLICY TOWARD RUSSIA—LET US TAKE A GOOD LOOK

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am very pleased to include in my brief remarks the leading editorial appearing in the Washita Valley Herald of Thursday, January 30, 1964, of which my nephew, Bayard C. Auchincloss, is publisher. This editorial entitled "Our Policy Toward Russia—Let Us Take a Good Look," is very timely and to the point and I hope that my colleagues will read it carefully.

I believe it discusses a thought which is in the minds of a great many people throughout the country because everyone is concerned about the encroachment of communism throughout the free world and particularly the Western Hemisphere. I believe the time has come, if indeed it has not already passed, when we should stiffen our attitude toward this godless ideology and it is a concern to all Americans that as the editorial says:

Lately, of course, we have noticed them [sic Communists] inching along making gains anyway, despite our efforts to contain them.

I think also the observation that "It is the small businessman that represents the greatest threat to communism" is fundamentally true and we as a nation should give this fact the support and attention it deserves.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chickasha (Okla.) Washita Valley Herald, Jan. 30, 1964]

OUR POLICY TOWARD RUSSIA—LET'S TAKE A GOOD LOOK

Just what is our policy toward the Russians, anyway? We seem to be mollycoddling them all the time. What kind of a strategy do we have that prompts this sort of thing?

Recently I received a copy of a little bi-weekly pamphlet put out by the Government which explains the official point of view on world problems. Our policy toward communism was outlined quite simply and concisely.

(1) We aim to have a strong enough military and nuclear force to provide a deterrent to the Russians starting any large-scale war. This force is especially important, because we do not have any defense against nuclear weapons, as the article puts it.

(2) We aim to always try to settle all disputes by negotiations rather than by the use of force.

Well, both of these aims seems to be good enough, looked at superficially. Of course it all depends on how we handle them. What kind of negotiations are we going to follow with the Russians? Would we give in to them to prevent the use of force? While these two aims of our foreign policy toward the Russians might seem pretty good on the outside their worth very much depends on our attitude and method as we pursue them.

There is another consideration, however. For many years we have adopted a view of holding the Russians where they stand. We want to draw a line, and beyond this they shall not pass, we say. Lately, of course, we have noticed them inching along making gains anyway, despite our efforts to contain them.

There is a basic fallacy in the idea of simply containing our enemies. It's as if there were two competing businesses across the street from each other. One man holds the line with the customers he already has, the other aggressively seeks new customers, actively promoting his wares. Who wins? Everyone knows that the aggressive merchant will eventually take over the other man's business.

It's the same in international affairs. We need to adopt a more active view toward our kind of government. We need to promote democracy vocally and aggressively throughout the world. It is the best way, we have proved it, why not push for it as the best way of life yet found on this earth. Let's not promote socialism around the world, as we have been doing, let's continually seek out the private investor, with the accent on the small businessman. It's the small businessman that represents the greatest threat to communism: he's the Communists' first target wherever they go. He is the real symbol of free enterprise, and where the small businessman exists in great numbers, there you will find freedom.

If we will stop apologizing for our greatness, and begin selling the way we got there, then this losing holding operation will stop, and we'll really push back the Communists into the tight little cell where they belong.

CUBAN AND SOVIET FISHING VESSELS WITHIN FLORIDA TERRITORIAL WATERS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, early this morning the U.S. Coast Guard escorted four Cuban fishing boats into Key West after they had been caught within the territorial waters of Florida. It is reported that the captain of the mother ship of this group said that they were engaged in fishing, which was in violation of the law of the State of Florida.

Cuban and Soviet fishing vessels are not a new sight in Florida waters, or anywhere along the eastern seaboard of this Nation, where they have been sighted in increasing numbers. In the past, when they have been seen inside our territory off Florida, the Coast Guard has either been unwilling or unable to catch them, insisting that the passage was innocent. To the best of my knowledge none of these ships had ever boarded to prove or disprove this assumption. The Coast Guard and the State Department are to be highly commended, therefore, for their actions last night and this morning.

We are probably the only Nation in the world that would make a presumption in favor of an adversary. Our own fishing fleet is constantly being harassed by other nations around the globe sometimes when we have come no closer to their shores than a hundred miles. Yet our own Government has permitted foreign vessels to not only approach, but actually come within our outmoded 3-mile limit.

In this latest action, the Coast Guard has at last recognized the need for our vigilance, a fact that must have been backed up by the State Department, which seems to have a veto power over such matters.

Only last week a spokesman for the State Department told the Senate Merchant Marine Committee that there was a potential threat to U.S. security from these fishing boats, and that we would soon see an increase in their activity due to new bases being completed in Cuba with Russian help.

Now that we have seen some action taken along the lines asked for last year by Chairman PORTER HARDY and his Investigations Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, which met on this matter at my request, the follow-through becomes all important.

A complete investigation by responsible Federal officials should be undertaken to see exactly what these four Cuban boats were doing in our waters. They may in fact have been fishing. If so, their catch and boats should be forfeited for violating the law. If they here to do more than just fish, we should determine their true mission. It is reported that some 46 men were aboard these small ships, a large number for the size of the vessels and their stated operation.

Of course, in a question of security, Federal law should be enforced. If, however, the violation is for fishing in Florida waters, the Federal Government should turn the ships and men over to Florida State officials for prosecution under the State laws.

As a warning to the Russian and Cuban trawlers which operate near the United States, an example should be made of these four boats, so that all will know we will take every step necessary for our own security. This action was long in coming—I had requested it many months ago—but we can congratulate those responsible in this case for their good work, and hope that it is the beginning of a more realistic policy toward Castro's Cuba.

COMPETITION, THE CONSUMER, AND MARKET POWER IN FOOD DISTRIBUTION

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

MR. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on America's agricultural economy of last week was both realistic and incisive. He addressed himself squarely to finding ways for our Nation to better achieve the potential

of the abundance with which those growing food and fiber have blessed us.

It was a far-reaching message, dealing with a great number of vital problems, including food for peace, the administration's war on poverty, resource conservation, and surplus food programs.

In the main, the message related to the agricultural sector of our economy and the problems faced by the rural portions of our Nation. But the message contained much of importance to those living in urban centers, too.

All consumers everywhere, the small business sector of our economy, and those engaged in agriculture are all vitally interested in the President's call for a study of the effects of market power in food distribution. As you will recall, the President said:

Ninth, Market power: There is one more pressing need if American agriculture is to be strengthened. The recent changes in the marketing structure for distribution of food are as revolutionary as those in production. There are some 200,000 retail grocery stores, but we know that \$1 out of every \$2 spent for groceries goes to fewer than 100 corporate, voluntary or cooperative chains. Our information about how this greatly increased concentration of power is affecting farmers, handlers, and consumers is inadequate. The implications of other changes that take place, as vertical integration and contract farming have not been fully explored. I urge that the Congress establish a bipartisan Commission to study and appraise these changes so that farmers and business people may make appropriate adjustments and our Government may properly discharge its responsibility to consumers.

I heartily applaud the President's call for study and appraisal of the distributive sector of the food industry. The price of food, its production and distribution, are vital to our entire economy. The consumer is entitled to the full benefit of competition, unshackled by any vestige of restraint of trade, unfair practices or undue economic concentration. It is our duty to act promptly now so that we may act wisely later. The study urged by the President will supply Congress with all the facts. We then will be able to proceed with such legislation as appears needed in this most important area.

The increasing integration which is taking place within the food industry has been a subject of continuing scrutiny by the Select Committee on Small Business through its Subcommittee on Distribution, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman.

During the 88th Congress, the food industry was one of those covered by our hearings on dual distribution. In making our study we received testimony from several segments of the food industry. We also availed ourselves of the recent Federal Trade Commission report on the frozen fruit juice and vegetable industry and the excellent analysis on dual labeling by Willard F. Mueller, Director of the Commission Bureau of Economics. Each of these shows disturbing amounts of increasing concentration in food distribution.

Both the Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, and the five members of the Federal